

# NATIVE AMERICAN GRAVES PROTECTION AND REPATRIATION REVIEW COMMITTEE MEETING

8:40 a.m.

Sunday, May 24, 2009

Emerald II Room

The Red Lion on Fifth Avenue

Seattle, WA

# COMMITTEE MEMBERS PRESENT:

Mr. Colin Kippen, Chair

Ms. Sonya Atalay

Mr. Alan Goodman

Mr. Eric Hemenway

Mr. Dan Monroe

# TABLE OF CONTENTS

CALL TO ORDER 4
INVOCATION 4
WELCOME
NOMINATIONS FOR AT-LARGE MEMBER - CONT'D 5
PARK NAGPRA PROGRAM
PRESENTATION
PUBLIC COMMENT - BAMBI KRAUS 40
BREAK 62
PUBLIC COMMENT - ANTHONY GARCIA
PUBLIC COMMENT - FRANK WOZNIAK
PUBLIC COMMENT - ART HUTCHINSON/FRED BUNCH 84
PUBLIC COMMENT - ROBIN WILSON 91
COMMENT - COLIN KIPPEN 98
CLOSING COMMENTS 101
CLOSING - ERIC HEMENWAY 106
MEETING ADJOURNED

#### CALL TO ORDER

COLIN KIPPEN: Good morning. Good morning to all of you. I'd like to call the NAGPRA Review

Committee meeting to order. This is our second of two days of meetings. We will have some business this morning and then we will be open for comments.

But before we begin, I'd like to ask committee member Eric Hemenway to open this meeting for us with a blessing.

#### INVOCATION

ERIC HEMENWAY: (Native American language.)

I said miigwetch to (Native American language) for having everybody come here. In our language we always say there's no Great Spirit or one spirit, we say the Lead Spirit. And that's what I feel we need to do is like lead with what we're doing by examples and good work so we can accomplish what we need to accomplish.

And I'd like to say miigwetch, thank you in our language, to the tribes who occupy this area and acknowledge them because this was their home first, and I say miigwetch for everybody on the NAGPRA Program and for the Review Committee and everybody in attendance. (Native American language.)

#### WELCOME

COLIN KIPPEN: Good morning, committee members, good morning, staff, and good morning, all of you who have come to be with us on the second day of our two days of meetings.

Mr. Tarler.

DAVID TARLER: Good morning. Mr. Chairman, on our agenda today we have a presentation and then we have time for public comment and several members of the public have come up to me and have asked that they be placed on the agenda to make public comments.

Before we begin with our presentation, Sherry Hutt, the Manager of the National NAGPRA Program, has a question for the committee.

#### NOMINATIONS FOR AT-LARGE MEMBER - CONT'D

SHERRY HUTT: I just have one matter that I'd like to clarify from yesterday if we might, and that deals with the nominations to the Secretary by the Review Committee for that seventh member. And I want to ask counsel, can someone who is otherwise duly appointed but has not filled out their forms that are predicate to serving each year, the May 15 forms, can they serve in a meeting?

STEPHEN SIMPSON: From what I can tell from the charter and the rules for special government  $\ensuremath{\mathsf{SIMPSON}}$ 

1 employees, no.

SHERRY HUTT: And Mr. DFO, do you have the forms from the absent member?

DAVID TARLER: I do not.

SHERRY HUTT: And I'd like to ask the committee if you would, if you might consider resolving the issue of the nominees for that at this time because the only four people who are duly appointed and having filled out their forms are sitting right here today. If - and you were asked by the DFO to circulate the resumes of the nominees prior to the meeting and you did so, and you've discussed four names and you have the resumes of those four people. And I'm asking if you might reconsider yesterday's determination and consider consensus on those four names so that we might in the program put those names together for the Secretary.

The reason I say this, and again in the spirit of openness and candor there were some questions here as to what was done in between meetings between the National NAGPRA Program and the Review

Committee, and I want to be totally candid, totally transparent as we always have been. And that is that that seventh member's term will expire in 60 days. It takes about 90 days in a normal process to

have the name vetted through the process in the
White House and obtain the Secretary's signature.

It is the National NAGPRA Program's obligation to
staff this committee and to serve it such - in many
ways, one of which is to make certain that we have a
fully duly-constituted panel available to be at
meetings at each - at each juncture.

And if you're not comfortable and you'd like me to pursue obtaining those forms from the absent member and schedule the telephone conference that you talked about in the future, that's - I mean, we will go with your wishes, but then I would like some parameters of time as to how long we should pursue the matter before we set up the telephone conference that enables you to put together the list that we can then get to the Secretary, because any delay that will keep us from getting that list moving forward dims the possibility that you have a seventh member for your next meeting, which is now set in October in Sarasota, or to do the business of the meeting, the planning business that goes on.

And I don't want anyone at any time, and I do - I work for the National Park Service and I'm responsible to the Secretary, and I don't want anyone at any time to think that the National NAGPRA

Program was recalcitrant in getting those
nominations to the Secretary such that in due course
an appointment could be made and you could be fully
constituted. So I seek your desires and your
quidance and your direction this morning.

1

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

COLIN KIPPEN: Thank you for your comments. have some concerns about what you've just raised, and I need to be, again, open and transparent as The forms that we were supposed to fill out, if any of you are on the committee, what you will know is that those - that request came from the came to us I believe on May 13th. The forms were due on May 15th. And in fact I attempted to meet those requirements on May 15th by going online to the government agency that has these forms, and their website crashed and I could not get the forms. And I spent most of the 15th filling out those forms and I did complete those forms and I have them. And the DFO, Mr. Tarler, has allowed us to transmit those forms through him to our Designated Federal Officer and I believe it's Ms. Glicker-Moran. that her name?

DAVID TARLER: Gicker.

COLIN KIPPEN: Gicker-Moran.

DAVID TARLER: Moran-Gicker.

COLIN KIPPEN: So the idea that - or I guess the concern that we need to move forward and essentially remove a member from this committee who has not complied with this form-filing requirement, in light of the circumstances surrounding the way those forms were transmitted to us, to me is not fair. And I also am under the impression and I've been informed by Ms. Hutt that Donna Augustine is, in fact, not well and in fact has a sick child that she is caring for. I am - this is just hearsay information given to me but I am concerned about removing a member of this committee from being able to participate in light of these circumstances.

SHERRY HUTT: Mr. Chairman, I'm not suggesting that she be removed from the committee, only that we deal with the business with those who are able to conduct business. And since I'm the one that had direct contact, I can tell you that those forms can be turned in - can be handwritten and sent in, and she and I have had - in other paperwork in preparation for her travel here, things have gone back and forth. So we've had pretty constant conversation over the last two weeks leading up to it and she had some issues with the forms. Now if she chooses to fill out those forms, fine; if not,

we'll deal with that in due course. And I don't think we should extend that conversation here in public on her -

COLIN KIPPEN: Is she - but if you say that she's - that we need to go forward with a deliberative process that does not include her, is she not then being removed from this committee?

SHERRY HUTT: If you would like - if you would like to wait until she has full opportunity to deal with those forms and submit them, then I ask you - I ask your guidance, how long you would like me to deal with that issue before we schedule a telephone conference? I'm fine with whatever your guidance is. I just don't want anyone to ever think that the National NAGPRA Program was recalcitrant in getting those names to the Secretary in time for the next meeting. I mean, I'll work with it, whatever - you know, whatever parameters you want.

COLIN KIPPEN: What I - what I would expect and what I would suggest is that we move as quickly forward with this telephonic meeting and I - again, I'm not aware of what Ms. Augustine's present circumstances are. I've not had any contact with her. But I am concerned that a Native member of this committee be in any way not able to participate

or be prevented from participation. Obviously there are things that need to be accomplished, but I can just tell you from my own perspective that there were some extenuating circumstances to being able to get the information to Mr. Tarler and to Ms. Gicker-Moran. So I think it needs to be part - we need to have a fair and open process.

The other thing I would suggest is that can we do this within two weeks? Is it possible for us and perhaps what you could do, Ms. Hutt, is just inform us, use due diligence to attempt to contact her.

SHERRY HUTT: I can tell you that over the last three days I have called the three numbers that I have for her and emailed at the email addresses and tried contact at her friend in Maine with whom she often stays, and I've had no response in the last three days.

DAN MONROE: Mr. Chair?

COLIN KIPPEN: Yes.

DAN MONROE: I suggest that - I understand that
- exactly the intent of the - bringing to our
attention. I think there's a concern on a number of
us - the part of a number of us that we really don't
wish to remove someone from this important
consideration. On the other hand, there's a concern

in moving forward in a timely manner.

1

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

If there are issues pertaining to the filling out of the form that Ms. Augustine has and she opts for whatever reason not to do so quickly or to proceed to finish those forms, there's really nothing we can do about that. But I think that what I would suggest is that we set a time limit, I think that it's fair to say a week to obtain those forms, that we set - we make a commitment among ourselves to find a time for a teleconference call within the next 10 to 12 days, no longer than 12 days, and that we carry out this important discussion, hopefully with Ms. Augustine's involvement at that time. she opts not to finish the forms or get them in on time then we will have created the opportunity for her to do so and we will still be not that distant in terms of the time difference between resolving this matter now and resolving it 10 to 12 days from now.

COLIN KIPPEN: I think that's a good approach.

The question that I have is what is the implication in terms of her long-term involvement? If she don't have the form in, is she not able to participate?

Is she no longer a member of this committee? What is the long-term implication? And the reason I'm

asking this question is I think she's an important member. She's a Native religious leader who is part of our committee, and I think that her voice is really an important voice to have on the committee.

So I - this is a legal question I'm asking
Mr. Simpson or the DFO, you can delegate the response to me. Mr. Simpson?

STEPHEN SIMPSON: Yes, Mr. Chairman. The charter of the committee specifically says all members will comply with applicable ethics rules and regulations. Part of compliance with applicable ethics rules and regulations for special government employees is filing this form. This is not unusual for any government employee. I have been filing these forms for years.

The - so there would be some question as to whether - whether Ms. Augustine could stay as a member of the committee without filing the ethical - without fulfilling the ethical rules. We would have to - I would have to check with the ethics people in the Department to make sure of that.

There is also the provision in the charter for a member who fails to attend substantive - two successive meetings of the committee or otherwise fails to substantively participate in the work of

the committee that person may be removed from the committee by the Secretary. I am not alleging that Ms. Augustine has done either one of those things. This is the first meeting that she has missed as my knowledge since she has been appointed. And she has certainly participated heavily in the substantive work of this committee. But it does have to - we do have to think about this.

ALAN GOODMAN: Colin, can I - thank you. First, I want to thank Dan for his compromise. I think that to me sounds very workable and due diligence within due time. I had sort of a tangential question for Sherry about the vacant seat, and I know this is guesswork, but do you have any sort of educated guess as to when that seat might be filled or a range of -

SHERRY HUTT: We were trying so hard to get it before this meeting and it could happen within this coming week.

ALAN GOODMAN: And you know, part of the reason I ask, of course, is that that's another Native American-Hawaiian organization seat, and it would be nice for sort of questions of balance and otherwise to have that person as part of this deliberation.

But if it - I would also just add that if that isn't

going to happen within a week or so, we shouldn't hold up the process.

1

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

DAN MONROE: Mr. Chair, also just to put it on the record, while each of us is appointed as a representative - by, not as a representative, by different groups, either museum, scientific and so on groups or by federally recognized tribes or Native Hawaiian organizations, once we become members of the Review Committee we have a shared group responsibility for implementation of the law. And the Review Committee does not function as a legislature. In other words, we're not here to specifically represent one interest or another. We're here to bring our expertise to the table and to oversee and help implement NAGPRA. So it becomes very important and it's part of the tradition of this Review Committee to function together as a group, and that's why at least, I think, most of the members of the committee, if not all, are recoiling from what is otherwise a very logical suggestion.

I would add to the suggestion I made earlier that if you are not able to reach Ms. Augustine within the time that we've prescribed we will move forward. In other words, we will dedicate this amount of time to allow her, given the

circumstances, to decide what she wants to do about the forms to get them in to you, which can be done I think online sometimes, and — or otherwise get them to you. And we'll proceed on this schedule so that we, in fact, are able to fulfill the important requirement of moving this forward in a timely manner. But I just think it's important to explain why the committee is responding as it is.

SHERRY HUTT: And then if the new person receives notice from the Secretary, might we step back a few more days to make sure that that person is then involved -

DAN MONROE: Yeah.

SHERRY HUTT: - and has time to look at the resumes and come up to speed.

COLIN KIPPEN: My concern is really that what we are - let me start again. I wholeheartedly agree with everything that Dan - Mr. Monroe and Mr. Goodman have said about this issue. My concern is that when I asked Mr. Simpson about the requirement it wasn't clear to me whether or not there were any sanctions that were clearly stated that should apply in this situation. And so my concern is that we act fairly with respect to this - to Ms. Augustine.

My recollection about the way this committee has operated in the past, at least during my tenure on the committee, is that we had one individual who was able - who had missed more than two meetings and continued service on this committee because of extenuating health issues. And that person was allowed to continue. And again, it goes to that question of the meaning of the word "may." We may do one thing. We may do another thing. So clearly it is a matter of discretion.

SHERRY HUTT: Let me clarify the record. We had an individual that missed two meetings. The letter was on the Secretary's desk for signature. The Secretary didn't sign it by the time of the next meeting, and two days prior to the meeting the individual called and said I'll be at the meeting tomorrow. So that individual then came to a meeting after missing two, came to one, then missed thereafter. So it wasn't more than two consecutive meetings and such that the Secretary was able to act under the rules. It's not that someone waived the rules. I don't want anyone to think that we've waived the rules or act arbitrarily or differently with regard to any individuals.

COLIN KIPPEN: You know, there is another way to

proceed I think in this, and that is to require that National NAGPRA use best efforts and that you log your best efforts and that we do this within a week so that we know that you've made an attempt. And then if we go forward, which I believe we will, in a telephonic conference we need to include in that conversation - in the document that we send if we go forward with less than all of the members, and I will be recusing myself from that vote as I should. But after that vote is taken, and I'm fairly certain how that vote will turn out given the fact that we do - we have some excellent candidates here and we want to have a - want to give the Secretary options. In any event, once that vote is taken we need to just simply include in the transmittal to the Secretary that we were unable to secure that last person's involvement because of extenuating circumstances, and as part of that communication we can simply indicate the best efforts that were used by this committee to assure that that missing member was able to participate. So it seems to me that we can - we can really work this out in a way that is fair.

1

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Again, I am just very concerned about sanctions and removals of members of this committee. I am

particularly concerned about that issue in light of the fact that there is no quorum requirement. So in the event there are any administrative difficulties with things like travel or anything else and less than all of the members come to meetings, what will occur is that you will have a very limited group passing upon these most important issues. So again, this is not something we should be hasty in acting upon, and I think what we've done is given you the opportunity to make that decision. I would say a week, and I would say that you set up that conference call within two weeks, and that you use the next week and log your attempts to contact Ms. Augustine so that we will have a record and then we will go forward with a telephonic conference with all of the members in attendance where we will vote these names, vote upon the recommendation to the Secretary.

1

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

SHERRY HUTT: Mr. Chairman, we will keep a log of our efforts to manage this meeting. Is the - is it a single agenda item for the meeting, that being the member, or are there other agenda items?

COLIN KIPPEN: Presently, I think that's the only - the only issue that we have presently, and I would like to dispose of that as quickly as we can.

1	SHERRY HUTT: Is this a public meeting or a
2	private meeting?
3	COLIN KIPPEN: That's a - Ms. Hutt, you're
4	asking exactly the right questions.
5	Mr. Simpson, I need you to provide me with a
6	template as how - as to how I need to proceed in
7	this matter. Are we simply continuing this meeting
8	or are we simply delving - are we just involved in
9	an administrative process where we could simply have
10	a telephonic conference amongst ourselves?
11	STEPHEN SIMPSON: My reading, Mr. Chairman, of
12	the Federal Advisory Committee Act and its
13	implementing regulations would lead me to advise you
14	that this is a meeting on administrative matters of
15	the committee and that therefore the Federal
16	Advisory Committee Act does not require that this
17	meeting be public.
18	COLIN KIPPEN: All right. So we will simply
19	have a telephonic conference - let me understand
20	what you've said and state it back to you.
21	STEPHEN SIMPSON: That's fine.
22	COLIN KIPPEN: So at the end of today's meeting,
23	we can adjourn this meeting?
24	STEPHEN SIMPSON: Yes, sir.
25	COLIN KIPPEN: And then we will be - we will
	Lesa Koscielski Consulting
	Rapid City, South Dakota

Rapid City, South Dakota (605) 342-3298

1	have an administrative telephonic conference which
2	you will set up and you will inform us about. Is
3	that correct? And that meeting need not be
4	publically noticed or - and does not fall within
5	FACA. Is that your opinion?
6	STEPHEN SIMPSON: That's correct.
7	COLIN KIPPEN: All right.
8	SHERRY HUTT: And Mr. Chairman, that's assuming
9	that's the only agenda item.
10	COLIN KIPPEN: Yes.
11	STEPHEN SIMPSON: That's why Ms. Hutt asked that
12	question.
13	COLIN KIPPEN: Yes, and that is - that is the
14	only agenda item, but I do want to say to you -
15	SHERRY HUTT: Are you recusing yourself from
16	that meeting?
17	COLIN KIPPEN: I'm going to chair the meeting
18	and I'm going to recuse myself from the vote. But I
19	want to make sure that before we actually get to
20	that place and in fact if someone else wants to
21	conduct the vote when we get to that, I would
22	designate or ask someone to actually handle the
23	vote. But I need to be assured that best efforts
24	have occurred and that we have a record of what has
25	occurred with respect to one of our missing members.

And I think that's a fair process. I see that as my role as the Chair of this committee. But I do want this vote to go forward and I know that there are at least two individuals in this room who are - three - two individuals in this room who are seeking that appointment and are willing to serve and I want to tell you that it is my commitment that we get that vote done in a timely fashion so that your name, if the committee decides that that is the case that it will be - it will move forward.

STEPHEN SIMPSON: Mr. Chairman, with respect to what you just said about conducting the vote, not to cut off any sort of volunteers from the committee but I would remind the committee that yesterday you elected a Vice-Chair.

COLIN KIPPEN: Okay.

STEPHEN SIMPSON: And that would make sense.

COLIN KIPPEN: For purposes of this - I would like to be included on the call and I can tell you my involvement will be with respect to this issue that I have highlighted for the committee about Ms. Augustine's involvement, but I would say, Dan, you absolutely have to be on that call. All of us need to be on that call, and I intend for - I intend to recuse myself once I am satisfied that we have

conducted that in an appropriate fashion. I will then turn that over to Dan and, Dan, you will conduct the meeting.

SHERRY HUTT: Perhaps, not to belabor this, but I understand your concern with the proof of the process that you're asking, and one better way to do that might be if we give you proof of the process prior to entering into the telephone call, because if you get into the telephone call and decided we haven't done enough, then we'll have to recess the telephone call, go back and do more work.

What I would prefer to do is give you the proof of our process and our diary and the steps that we have gone through in preparation for the meeting, send that all to you in an email prior to the meeting, obtain your permission to have the meeting and your guidance that the steps have been adequate prior to having the meeting. I'd rather not have two telephone conferences, one where we analyze whether or not we have gone through sufficient steps. We can do that by email communication.

COLIN KIPPEN: I suggest that - my response is that that is not how I wish to proceed. My response is that you need to provide me with that information in advance of the call and I will - I need to be on

I will recuse myself from running the meeting.

Again, my concern is the issue of sanction and removal of a member under a set of circumstances that I think may well weigh in favor of the exercise of some discretion in favor of this member who is not present with us today. So again, I welcome that you provide me with that information. It is my intention - and I will immediately communicate to you as well as everyone else what my impression is about the set of information that you've provided but I intend to participate in that call as a member of the committee, but not to vote and not to chair it.

STEPHEN SIMPSON: Mr. Chairman, I don't think Ms. Hutt was suggesting that you not do so.

DAN MONROE: Mr. Chair, I understand the intent of the language, but I think it's important for the public record we make clear that no one suggested sanction or removal of a member. What we're discussing is the fact that a requirement - a Federal requirement has not been fulfilled by one of the members and therefore legally it's not possible for her at present to participate. So there was no desire on anyone's part to sanction or remove.

There's simply a posting up of the fact that in terms of Federal requirements that member can't participate and couldn't participate actually even if she were here.

What we're striving to do as a committee is to assure every opportunity, reasonable opportunity is being given to that member to be able to participate for the reasons I stated earlier. So I just think it's important for the public record to make it clear that we're not - no one is suggesting sanction or removal. We're working very hard as a committee to provide that opportunity for the reasons that we've given. I think the procedure is fine. My only question is how much time are we talking about, because we've had a week, two weeks, and some other times periods. How about ten days? Is that all right with everybody?

COLIN KIPPEN: I think ten days - I think that's a good suggestion, Mr. Monroe. I think - again, I'd like to move this as quickly as possible, but ten days is fine. If you could use your best efforts to contact her, log it, provide me with that information, and then schedule a meeting where everyone is in attendance. And I would ask all of the committee members that we need to make ourselves

available for that call.

We span six hours in difference of time. I'm on the - I'm three hours - I'm six hours behind East Coast time and several of you are on the East Coast. So we need to just find a time in the middle of the day. I will make myself available in the early morning. I usually arise at 4:30 every morning. So we can schedule this - I think you have a lot of opportunities and options in terms of timing. So I would like that to happen.

DAN MONROE: 4:30? Whoa.

know, for the committee staff and for the members here, please just understand that I've had some experience with some of these issues in other aspects of my life, issues of sanctions, issues of removal, issues of even proceeding forward, and I think we need to be cautious in terms of how we proceed because it is the process that at the end of the day people look at. And if they see it as a fair and open process, you know, the committee's credibility is enhanced. So - and I appreciate the - this issue was brought to us by Ms. Hutt, and I think it indicates she's done this is a very transparent and open way. We've had a discussion

that has been very direct on this point, and I appreciate your doing that because we would never have had this conversation had you not brought this issue forward. So I want you to understand that I very much appreciate the fact that this issue has been queued up for the committee and that we're able to discuss it. That says something about how we operate. So Mr. - is the committee satisfied? Are we all satisfied?

All right. Mr. Tarler, may we move forward?

DAVID TARLER: Yes, the first item on the agenda
is a presentation by Cyd Martin and Mary Carroll of
the National Park Service, Park NAGPRA Program.

# PARK NAGPRA PROGRAM

#### PRESENTATION

#### CYD MARTIN

CYD MARTIN: Good morning. I know from being in the audience it was difficult to hear people speaking from this table, so can you hear me? Excellent.

COLIN KIPPEN: Good morning.

CYD MARTIN: Good morning. I'm Cyd Martin. I am the Program Manager for the Park NAGPRA Program and also Director for Indian Affairs in the Intermountain Region of the National Park Service.

And I have with me Mary Carroll who is the program lead for the Park NAGPRA Program. And we just have a quick update for you.

First of all, I'd really like to thank the committee for all of your work, time and attention to all of these issues. I know it's a lot of work. I've seen the size of the folders and I just want you to know that all of us in the field really appreciate it.

The other thing that I think is important to note for the record is that Federal agencies are not a single entity and that NAGPRA implementation is variable from agency to agency and I just want to get that on the record because there's a lot of discussion about agency compliance. The Park Service and many of our sister agencies work very hard at NAGPRA compliance and in addition actually illustrating that we also not only work independently but we actually collaborate together also with the tribes. And in the public comment Superintendent Art Hutchison from Great Sand Dunes will make a note of one collaboration that was extremely successful.

So that said, I'd like Mary to go ahead and give our report.

#### MARY CARROLL

MARY CARROLL: Thank you. As Cyd said, my name is Mary Carroll. I am the program lead for the Park NAGPRA Program of the National Park Service.

First, I'd like to give you a brief overview of the Park NAGPRA Program, particularly for the new members of the committee. Unlike other Federal agencies, the NPS both complies with NAGPRA and administers NAGPRA. This dual role, which was initially performed by a single NPS office, created some confusion about NPS compliance responsibilities. So we separated those two functions within NPS, establishing the National NAGPRA Program and Park NAGPRA Programs.

National NAGPRA administers NAGPRA external to NPS, including developing regulations and guidance, providing staff support to the Review Committee, managing the grants program, and assisting Indian tribes, Native Hawaiian organizations, museums and Federal agencies with the NAGPRA process. Park NAGPRA was created to oversee NPS's own compliance with NAGPRA. We ensure National Park Service compliance with NAGPRA and assist all National Park sites with their compliance activities, providing technical advice, guidance, training and funding.

Park NAGPRA is located in Denver, Colorado, in the Intermountain Region Office of Indian Affairs and American Culture. Our staff includes Program Manager Cyd Martin, who also is the Director of IAAC and Superintendant of the Southern Four Corners Parks, myself as the program lead, and a part-time student assistant. Each of the seven NPS regions has designated at least one person to serve as a regional NAGPRA coordinator, many are also regional ethnographers, and for some NAGPRA assistance is unfortunately a collateral duty.

The National Park Service and the Park NAGPRA Program recognize that chemical contaminants applied to museum objects may be hazardous to Native American communities, as the objects are repatriated and reintroduced into use. We acknowledge that cultural items subject to NAGPRA in NPS collections may have been treated with potentially dangerous materials. We are committed to proactively addressing the contaminated collections issue in National Parks. The NPS expressed its commitment by issuing a Director's Memo in November 2008. You should have a copy of that in your binders. Director's Memos are documents that direct the regional directors and superintendents to take

specific actions regarding a particular topic.

1

3

5

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

In the memo titled "Tribal Consultation on potential hazardous treatment of NAGPRA objects," the Director asked Regional Directors and Superintendents to go beyond NAGPRA's requirement to inform tribes of known treatments by taking two These steps are, first, in all governmentsteps. to-government NAGPRA consultations between NPS and Indian tribes or Native Hawaiian organizations, NPS officials will inform the tribes about the contaminated collections issue, whether the object's treatment history is known or not. NPS officials must discuss the potential that objects have been treated so that tribes are fully informed before they take NAGPRA items back into their tribal communities. And second, NPS officials must also inform the tribes that the NPS has the capacity to test for certain contaminants. If a tribe wishes to have the items tested, the NPS will arrange for testing by Intermountain Region Museum Services Program conservation staff.

To help park staff talk with tribes about the fact that NAGPRA items might be contaminated, Park NAGPRA developed a short, one-page document titled "Talking to Tribes about the potential presence of

hazardous chemicals in or on cultural items subject to NAGPRA." A copy of that is also in your binders. You can think of it as a crib sheet for the parks. It includes brief pointers for talking with tribes about potentially contaminated collections.

1

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

The second element of the Director's Memo is the directive to inform tribes that contaminants testing of cultural items subject to NAGPRA is available through NPS's Intermountain Region Museum To help parks with the testing Services Program. process, Park NAGPRA developed a guide titled "Contaminants Testing of Cultural Items Subject to NAGPRA," which should also be in your binders. quide was completed in March 2009 and is intended for use by parks that hold items that may have been treated with pesticides, preservatives, or other substances. It describes general requirements, outlines the process for requesting testing, and briefly discusses requests for contaminants testing from tribes or institutions outside NPS.

The three documents - the Director's Memo, the one-page crib sheet, and the guide to having items tested - are available to all NPS units on the NPS intranet site. Thank you for your time. We're happy to answer any questions you have.

COLIN KIPPEN: Thank you for your testimony. I would direct the committee to tab 10. Tab 10 in your materials contain the information that Mary Carroll just described to us. Does the committee have any comments or questions?

### REVIEW COMMITTEE QUESTIONS AND COMMENTS

CYD MARTIN: Colin, could I make one more comment?

COLIN KIPPEN: Sure.

CYD MARTIN: I just wanted to note anybody who's in a Federal agency knows how bureaucratic processes work, and I just would like to note that Mary and I really appreciated the fact that NPS leadership paid attention to this issue and really focused on it frankly. Because in order to get a memo out of the Director's Office takes a certain amount of effort and coordination and we were very impressed with the response from Washington.

COLIN KIPPEN: I want to also for the record indicate that this issue was queued up by National NAGPRA. We did have a presentation, I believe it was two or three meetings ago, where staff came forward and presented the issue of contamination and how to address it. So I believe that was the place where that awareness was brought to the committee's

attention and I believe that that was then followed up by work at the administrative — at a higher administrative level to move this policy statement forward. Is that correct?

1

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

CYD MARTIN: Yes, I think it is, but at least in Intermountain Region, and I believe in some of the others regions too, we've had a lot of interest from the tribes who have come to us with serious concerns where they have had items returned to them from other museums, not necessarily Park Service collections, that have been contaminated, were actually taken out and put - spread back out in the park - I'm sorry, in the tribal community, but then the contamination was realized. Those items had to be recollected out of actually people's homes. so there's been a lot of concern. The Hopi Tribe, in particular, still has items that are stored in Leigh Kuwanwisiwma's garage that he had to take So that - I think our tribes actually called it to our attention in that - kind of that neck of the woods.

COLIN KIPPEN: Thank you. Committee members, comments?

ALAN GOODMAN: Thank you for your presentation. So currently you're testing for heavy metals and

only heavy metals. Could you comment on that?

MARY CARROLL: Well, yeah, we have - the Western Archaeological - I can never remember the name - Conservation Center in Tucson, which is the Intermountain Region Museum Services Program, they recently, with - in cooperation with Park NAGPRA, purchased an XRF to test for heavy metals, so arsenic, mercury, and lead. So yeah, pretty much, I think they have some other capacity but this is focused on the heavy metals.

ALAN GOODMAN: So I guess my comment is - I mean, that's a very limited range of potential pollutants and contaminants, and is there any effort being made at this point to expand the range of testability to organic pollutants, for example?

CYD MARTIN: Yeah, testing for some of those — actually, I'm not that conversant in some of that, but I know it requires other equipment and other processes. And for us in all honesty this was a big step just to get the XRF, you know, to kind of hit the arsenic, mercury, and lead. So other contaminants we're having to just, you know, go by the process really that NAGPRA requires, which is to warn of the possibility or actually of known — yeah, but there's like paradichlorobenzene. And, you

know, and the parks definitely used those, you know, substances like that too, but so far we don't have any way to actually test for that.

ALAN GOODMAN: Thank you. And just to follow up, I mean, those are the things that personally I would be more concerned about. Those are the types of things that are more volatile and are more likely to spread to individuals who are handling them.

CYD MARTIN: Just as a personal anecdote, Alan, because I used to work in curation. Many, many years ago, I'm showing my age, I worked at Grand Canyon, and I remember going into the museum collection, which was managed by a very well-meaning elderly, at that time, woman, who was also the librarian, and I opened up one of the cases that held natural history items and she had used so much paradichlorobenzene that it had recrystallized on the inside of the case, like on the back. Like it just like knocked you over even when you walked into the room much less opening a cabinet, so it's a definite issue and danger.

COLIN KIPPEN: Thank you. Any further comments?

ERIC HEMENWAY: I'd like to make a comment. I'd like to thank you for coming here, and from a tribal perspective, contamination is a real serious issue.

With the few items I've been able to help repatriate back to my tribe the first concern is contamination. And we recently had some eagle feathers repatriated to us from a museum out in St. Louis, and once these feathers were returned the people in the community were like, well, Eric, what's up with those feathers? And I said you can't introduce them back into the community without having them tested first. And I know the testing process is pretty expensive and it's really limited, only certain individuals that I know of in the Midwest are qualified to do this and they have to have the machinery and the training to do this. So I appreciate the efforts on your park to actually do the testing and have the equipment available because a lot of times tribes will get stuff back but they don't have the funds to hire somebody or take the items to somebody to test them. And that's a pretty big issue with all the tribes it looks like across the board, because the ultimate goal is to reintroduce the item back in the community but you don't want to reintroduce something that's basically poisoned. So I thank you for taking a proactive effort in this. CYD MARTIN: Thank you, and just to note we try

1

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Lesa Koscielski Consulting Rapid City, South Dakota (605) 342-3298

too to accommodate tribal requests for testing, even

outside of our region. And I will note, probably because it would be of interest to the committee, that in Intermountain Region we are having more interest recently on summary items. So as we move through the process with inventory items the issues are arising, you know, the tribes are interested in reviewing summary items and having them repatriated and these exact issues will arise time and time again.

1

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

COLIN KIPPEN: I too wanted to thank you for the work that you did on this issue, and I specifically wanted to highlight two of the things that I've seen in this - in these materials. You have I think a very clear roadmap about how these issues need to occur, and it's rather technical but it needs to be. And then the second thing that you have here is the document, which is I think a - it's a one-page general summary, and I found that very clear. And I think that approach is really good because people have different experiences and probably different capacities with respect to these kinds of administrative requirements. And I think that those differences need to be understood, and it's about how you communicate. It also affects how we consult, because we do not all share a similar value

base and we do not have similar experiences. So I very much liked the very clear one-page presentation that you have.

1

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

I think that if you're not sophisticated about administrative processes, it really does help you to understand what you need to do, and I think after reading that you're much better able to understand the more technical roadmap that you've presented for people to follow. I'm saying this not only because it affects what you're doing but I'm saying this because it also affects how we do business on this committee. You know, we have a very, very broad range of experience and sophistication around these administrative issues and we need to always be concerned about how it is that we do our work in a way that we can communicate clearly with everyone across that spectrum, whether you are experienced in these administrative processes or whether you're So again, I really appreciate the approach. I'm glad you included that last page for us to look at because it helps us to better understand how you are communicating with tribal members.

COLIN KIPPEN: Thank you.

DAN MONROE: Thank you.

ERIC HEMENWAY: Thanks.

1 COLIN KIPPEN: Mr. Tarler.

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

DAVID TARLER: We will have public comment now.

The first person I would like to call is Bambi

Kraus, the Executive Director of the National

Association of Tribal Historic Preservation

Officers.

## PUBLIC COMMENT - BAMBI KRAUS

BAMBI KRAUS: Thank you very much. Thank you, committee members and staff of the National NAGPRA Program, other Federal officials and members of the audience who are here on a beautiful Sunday in Seattle. My name is Bambi Kraus. My first initial is D for Denise, for recording purposes. President of the National Association of Tribal Historic Preservation Officers. We're located in Washington, DC, and I bring greetings from our board. Our current chairman is Reno Franklin, who is Kashia Pomo. And our other members of the board, just to give people an idea of our scope and breadth, include members - the THPOs for Colville, Navajo, Ho-Chunk, Narragansett, Passamaquoddy, Mille Lacs, Makah, and Absentee-Shawnee, and I'm a member of the Tlingit Tribe and I'm also an elected tribal official from Kake, Alaska.

> Lesa Koscielski Consulting Rapid City, South Dakota (605) 342-3298

So today I'd like to just go over some things.

I wasn't able to attend the last meeting, the October meeting in San Diego, so I just wanted to get caught up on some of that. I did talk to the THPO from Colville, who had to leave, and she had to leave because she had to lead the cleanup for the tribal cemetery at the Colville Reservation. know Memorial Day is a tough time, but I use that as an example the differences that tribal representatives and Native people have to their communities versus what perhaps scientists may not have that role anymore, which is they're actually on the ground working in their communities. And I know many tribes around the country over this weekend are busy working with their communities to maintain and restore their tribal communities, tribal cemeteries in particular.

1

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

I also just wanted to make note two other things in case - I may not be the first, but I am born and raised here in Seattle, so I'd like to welcome everyone to the greater Seattle area, and I was surprised at the good weather. But it's - you know, it's encouraging that things go on and stay the same but changed quite a bit since I lived here a long time ago. I know there are many tribes here in the Seattle area. I wish more could have come

and I know that they care about this topic quite a bit. And perhaps the cost of coming here Memorial Day had something to do with it. I really don't know.

1

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

I wanted to give an update on - I'm calling it the Black and White Report. This is the report that I have met with you on before. Since it came out in August of '08, which I think was eight months ago, and I was unable to attend your last meeting in October in San Diego, I just wanted to give you an update on it and also just for the two members of the committee who are new, just go over some of the information in case you haven't had a chance to go This was funded to a grant, a NAGPRA grant over it. to the Makah Tribe who entered into an agreement with the National Association of THPOs to do the research, which was both publically available information and some original research. Again, I wanted to - since it wasn't published when I last presented before the committee, I just wanted to go over some highlights and I think one of the highlights, although it wasn't our original research, was a forward inserted by Senator Inouye, who was one of the original authors of the Act. And I'm not going to read the entire thing, it's very

short, but he expresses his support in terms of you know, this may be the first examination of how

Federal agencies are implementing the Act, but he
considers it something that, you know, we all need
to do and how important the law is and how important
it is for Indian law and for Indian practices. So
with that type of support I think it was a good sign
and so from that I just wanted to go over some of
the highlights.

Again, some of it's original research, some of it was publically available information, but we also decided to include information and to make it a learning tool. So in here we have excerpts of the law and citations, in case anybody wants to know what 10.7, 10.11 is, current status of 10.11, so that, you know, even though you may not know the law you can actually look through it and hopefully learn quite a bit. I know it's a very complex law and I learned a lot in going through it and I just think it's a process we have to learn, as long as this is the law of the land.

One of the - again, we - it was broken into seven major parts. I'm not going to go over each one. For example, I just explained one of them was the legislative and regulatory review. We also did

original information research. We had, excuse me, two staff, two people who were on contract with NATHPO to go to the Park Services offices in Washington, DC, and look at each original submission for the inventories and summaries. And they compared that to what was published in the Federal Register. So that's actually - their work is inserted as an appendix in the chart and, I'm sorry, the two new members weren't at the earlier meetings but we explained why some of the differences occur between what was submitted in the original paperwork and then what was actually published in the Federal Register.

What's interesting is since we've done this report, I've talked to several Federal officials and they were all excited and came up to me and said, you know, I saw - I heard about your report and they would pull out the page and say I can explain why this is different from that. And some people said that they were concerned because they had worked on the NAGPRA process for their entire history of their Federal agency and didn't understand that there was any discrepancies between what they had submitted originally and what they had been published - what had been published in Federal Register notices. And

one actually told me that I guess there's a new process on paperwork that has to be signed off on prior to the publication of a Notice of Inventory Completion. And I don't know exactly what that letter is. It's something that's an internal process to the National Park Service. But the bottom line in their comments was I didn't know that the Park Service was waiting for us to sign a pending Notice of Inventory Completion. As far as they knew, they had completed their work and now they had found out that the word came back to them that in fact they hadn't checked a box or signed a letter that said that they were now ready to publish their Federal Register notice.

I'm just reporting what I'm hearing. I'm trying not to insert any bias, whether as an elected tribal official or a tribal rep. I'm just reporting exactly how I've heard it. They've also sent me follow-up information on it. So my point in all of this is that I feel like the report is having an effect, and I think it's a positive effect because people are talking about NAGPRA. And I think that's good because, you know, it's an important law.

So on the culturally affiliated/culturally unidentifiable Native American inventory database,

you know, we did - a big part of this report included an examination of that, and since the report is published we pulled out some excerpts that, you know, I hadn't had a chance to go over with the committee in terms of our findings and preliminary recommendations. So for example, there are - there are records in the culturally unidentifiable Native American inventories database that state that skulls have been sent to the Smithsonian and there are no further notes. other words, where actually are these remains being housed and what is the relationship between the Federal agency and the Smithsonian and housing of that - those particular human remains. And some records also include information that will say in the notes that they have 12 human remains, but when they actually include the counts in the minimum number of individuals, they will list zero. So in other words, is there a significant undercount in what is actually being reported in the database?

1

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

The report also included two summaries on what we called high profile NAGPRA cases, Kennewick Man and Fallon Paiute and Spirit Cave Man, and if people have time I encourage them to read it because it demonstrates the importance of cultural affiliation

and collaboration of Federal agencies and tribes working together.

In terms of using publically available information, we also looked at the grants program by going to the Park Service's website, and I think it's been reported widely in the Indian press anyway that from Fiscal Year 1999 to Fiscal Year 2007 that over 3 million dollars had been taken from the line item in the grants fund and used for different purposes that were related to administrative purposes or other such, and I think that's been probably the most reported and talked about.

We also had - we did two national surveys of Federal Preservation Officers and Indian tribes,
Native Hawaiian organizations and Alaska Native
Corporations. Pretty much across the board everyone is asking for training. I've reported on that before. Interestingly enough, just to tag onto the previous witness, the contamination issue we had used as one of our survey questions, and no Federal agency who responded to our survey actually has a policy on how they handle contaminants. So there - you know, there are important parts of the law that could be strengthened and improved.

For project limitations and future research, of

course, we only looked at Federal agency implementation. It was a very small grant, and so I just wanted to let people know that again, this is just for Federal agencies, not museums.

1

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

I'm going to jump right to a summary of the recommendations. We had general recommendations and then we had eight specific recommendations. purposes of time, I'll just say that we had urged we had broken it down into legislative, regulatory, NAGPRA Program, NAGPRA Review Committee recommendations. So for purposes of oversight and enforcement, we would - we're calling for a creation of an interagency council, they would look at compliance and training. We also urge, for example, the National NAGPRA Program or an entity to publish NAGPRA contacts at each Federal agency. currently doesn't exist and I think it would help quite a bit for people to identify someone in each agency.

For the Review Committee, as you know it's your database, the culturally unidentifiable Native

American inventories database, and our recommendations felt that it could be improved in terms of search functions and the technology that's available. But we would also urge that the National

NAGPRA Program and the Review Committee maintain on its website an updated list of upcoming publication of Notices of Inventory Completion, and a list of these notices that are pending in terms of people being able to watch when they are going to be coming up. We also suggest that there may not be adequate money for the program, and that's just not for the National NAGPRA Program, but for Park NAGPRA, tribal NAGPRA. I mean it's - basically there's a need for more money to implement the Act. And we had also requested or recommended compliance audits, and we requested that the Congress request a General Accountability Office look - I mean audit, GAO audit into how the program is operating.

So Mr. Monroe, I know that we had talked about that at length in October of '07, and so I'm thinking that 20 months since we had that initial discussion that, you know, as we heard earlier there is someone here from the General Accountability Office to look at these - at this program and to learn more about it. So I think that's encouraging. So that - I just wanted to give an update on that report, and I had a few other comments. But I guess I'll stop and see if there are any questions on how the report has been distributed or if you have any

questions on the report in general. COLIN KIPPEN: Thank you, Ms. Kraus. Committee members, comments, questions? COLIN KIPPEN: No comments, no questions. have just a couple of questions. The report - once the report has been issued, you've distributed it to whom? BAMBI KRAUS: Well, we - in August of 2008, we 

sent hard copies to - I've got to remember this one is we put it on our website, and the website
went live in August, August of 2008. Hopefully all
of you who were on the committee received a hard
copy of it. I had a difficult time getting one to
Rosita Worl. I tried sending it via Fed Ex three
times, and three times it was refused by the
Sealaska Heritage Institute or the - I mean, the
Post Office refused to deliver it. So I've given
her one personally. But everyone who responded to
the survey got one, including the Federal officials,
but it's publically available on our website.

COLIN KIPPEN: And the improvements that you're - or I guess the conversations that you're seeing lead you to the conclusion that - what are - how do you see this as helping us to do what we are trying to accomplish here?

BAMBI KRAUS: Well, this was the first study on 1 a national level of how Federal agencies are 2 implementing the Act, and the bottom line is that 3 there's very little compliance on that level. There's very few incentives for Federal agencies to 5 6 comply with the Act. So I feel anyway that the fact that you're getting information out, including how 7 the Act was written and the regulations on how to 8 9 conduct the Act, you know, the more people who learn about how this is supposed to work and how it is 10 working or not working is strengthening the program. 11 12 If you're examining it anyway - I mean, I think it just strengthens the program rather than just tears 13 it down. 14 15 COLIN KIPPEN: On the issue of training, are you folks involved in any training? 16 17 BAMBI KRAUS: We have been quite a bit at NATHPO. It's one of our missions, to provide 18 19

BAMBI KRAUS: We have been quite a bit at NATHPO. It's one of our missions, to provide training. We've done that in small workshops, small 30-person seminars that are a week long. We trained with the National Trust for Historic Preservation about 100 lawyers and representatives from tribes on public land, protecting sacred sites on public land. So we've done quite a bit of training in the past.

20

21

22

23

24

25

SHERRY HUTT: Mr. Chairman, if I might on a

point of - I believe that training was funded by funds from the National NAGPRA Program in a cooperative agreement with NATHPO that was struck in September of '07 to fund that conference in October of '07. So although the National Park Service may have not been given credit - or the National NAGPRA Program, I just want to bring that to your attention.

BAMBI KRAUS: Actually, my reference to the National Trust was in 2003 and it was Denver before the National Trust Conference.

COLIN KIPPEN: So there's been a - so I guess to just again the takeaway is that there is some - there are some discrepancies in terms of how Federal agencies are implementing this. There are some discrepancies in terms of how they are doing their inventories, and there is a great need for capacity building amongst the Federal agencies. Is that a fair statement?

BAMBI KRAUS: I think it's a fair statement. I had an interesting experience with a woman who works for the Tennessee Valley Authority, and when I met with her two years ago about the project she was embarrassed — and I'm just speaking in gross terms here so — and I saw her recently and she came

running up to me telling me how excited they were because they were about to affiliate some remains.

So I think that - generally, I think people want to do the Act. I think that it's very complex. You really have to know it. It's very time-consuming, and I think because it's so time-consuming that it's very expensive. I think it takes a lot of money and commitment on the level of tribes or museums or Federal agencies to actually want to implement it.

COLIN KIPPEN: I don't have any further comments except to say that this is what I think our role is:

Our role is to be able to get factual information and to be able to ask policy questions and to shape policy in a way that allows for the Act to be enforced and the Act to actually be accomplished.

And I think it's a very difficult Act, especially when you spread it across all of the various museums across the country, of different sizes and of different locations and of different capacities, the same with Federal agencies, especially in times of budget shortfalls and just the need to be more efficient with every dollar they have to spend. So I think that it's important we do this work.

And I - as I read your report, I thought to myself that this is a good start, and I do see this

as sort of one of the preliminary steps before the 1 government accountability does its work, because you 2 have some information that you've assembled. When 3 they ask questions of Federal agencies, my 5 expectation is that they will get a very, very 6 different response in terms of willingness and the need for these agencies to comply with the requests 7 in an absolute - in the highest fashion. Because 8 9 the Government Accountability Office reports to the Congress, the Congress funds these programs. 10 there is a direct connection there. Anyone who's 11 ever worked on the Hill understands that the 12 Government Accountability Office is the 13 Accountability Office and it provides factual 14 15 information to guide policy and appropriations by the Congress. So I think that this is a good start 16 17 and I really look forward to the Government Accountability Office report to give us better 18 19 information. So thank you. If there are no more - are there 20 any more comments? No further comments? 21 22 BAMBI KRAUS: Can I - I just want to make - a 23 couple questions and just some updates also on -24 well, in terms of the cooperative agreement between the National Association of THPOs and the National 25

NAGPRA Program, we did indeed enter into an agreement in late September of 2007 for \$4,700 and it expired - it ran through October 31, 2008, and we - for the \$4,700 we were to have a trainer come to our tenth annual meeting in Palm Springs, California, to provide a training session on ARPA and NAGPRA violations. And that went successfully. We had a great response in terms of the attendance and the comments. They - you know, people really want to hear and get information on how to improve the Act and that means compliance. So thank you very much for your - all of your support for that. We were - we closed it out and on April 14th, 2009, NATHPO was paid \$4,316.56. I'd like that to be noted in the record because one of the issues related to that was whether or not the money that was paid to NATHPO came out of the grants line item or not, and NATHPO was assured by the Park Service that no grant money was used in the cooperative agreement. So I'd like the record to clearly state that. SHERRY HUTT: We will so state, Chairman, that the discussion that Ms. Kraus and I had in June, July, and August of 2007 was that the funds were

1

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Lesa Koscielski Consulting Rapid City, South Dakota (605) 342-3298

coming from the law enforcement funds for training,

and that's where they came from. There were the funds that had been much discussed by Ms. Kraus regarding the funds that were left on the table were not left on the table until July of 2008, which was, what, ten months after completion of the performance of the cooperative agreement. So the grant funds could not have - I'm not clairvoyant, I couldn't tell that ten months after we entered into the cooperative agreement that grant funds would be left on the table. So that there's no confusion on that, there was no confusion when the funds were given where they were coming from and what they were for, and they were given in 2007, September 2007. paperwork reached my office in March of 2009. if there's any questions on this cooperative agreement or any cooperative agreement we had with NPI, and I say that because I have to leave, put it on the next agenda and I'll give you all the paperwork.

1

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

COLIN KIPPEN: Actually I'm not - I'm a little confused here as to what the - what this conversation is about.

SHERRY HUTT: It's just - I have no idea, but if we're going to go back into this issue that was raised before, know that we will give you whatever

paperwork you want and supply it all. 1 BAMBI KRAUS: I'll just - for clarification, and 2 I'm happy to move on with the topic, is that NATHPO 3 does not want to take money away from tribes, Native Hawaiian organizations or Alaska Native Corporations 5 6 or museums in terms of the grant money. And there was a comment made in public that we had taken money 7 from the grant program. And that's my request to 8 9 have it clearly written on the record that we did not take -10 COLIN KIPPEN: I took notes on your 11 12 presentation, and you - I think the fifth point you made in telling us about the highlights was that you 13 - there was a finding about money being taken from 14 15 the grant program to be used for other, I think you said, administrative purposes. So it sounds to me 16 17 like what you're saying is that the funds that you 18 got were not from the grant program. Is that what you're saying? 19 BAMBI KRAUS: That is my - right. 20 COLIN KIPPEN: Again, that's another - that's a 21 22 separate issue. That's -23 BAMBI KRAUS: Right, I understand. 24 COLIN KIPPEN: But now I understand what you're 25 talking about. Are there any more comments or

questions?

BAMBI KRAUS: Well, I'd like to also say that if there is such a thing as a vendor list for the NAGPRA Program, I think NATHPO would like to be included in that for any future work or any kind of notices on training or technical assistance.

COLIN KIPPEN: Are you available to do the kinds of training that is presently being offered by other vendors?

BAMBI KRAUS: Oh yeah, especially at the funding level that's being offered to develop new courses and provide travel scholarships. We have had several agreements with the Park Service in our 11-year history to do such workshops that we've already discussed today.

COLIN KIPPEN: Okay. Any further questions? No further questions. Thank you.

BAMBI KRAUS: Well, I just had a couple more questions for the actual  ${\mathord{\text{--}}}$ 

COLIN KIPPEN: We're going to have to wrap this up here, so please -

BAMBI KRAUS: One is I think that there is some urgency to finish some of these reserved sections of the Act because the Act was signed on November 16, 1990, and almost 20 years have passed since the Act

was actually signed into law.

1

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Finally, does Indian preference apply at the National NAGPRA Program? If there's a vacant position for the regulations spots, I think it would be good for Indian Country to know - my understanding there are currently no Native Americans who work for the NAGPRA Program - whether or not Indian preference applies at the National NAGPRA Program.

And then finally just two NATHPO updates, I invite you all to attend the eleventh annual NATHPO meeting that will be in Durant, Oklahoma, hosted by It's going to be the the Choctaw of Oklahoma. second week of August. And then just to say thanks to David Tarler and Sherry Hutt because they had provided some assistance early on in the NATHPO state laws project. And for those who are interested, you can actually go to the NATHPO website, NATHPO.org, and click on "Law Enforcement," and there is a state law database there that you can look at the current state laws. I think what they're talking about is going to be much more thorough and I'd look forward to seeing it. I just want to let people know right now that there's several sources to look up state law citations and

different types of penalties and right now NATHPO 1 has a version from 2006, I think, that's on our 2 website today. So thank you very much. 3 COLIN KIPPEN: Thank you. DAN MONROE: Thank you. 5 STEPHEN SIMPSON: Mr. Chairman. 6 COLIN KIPPEN: Yes. 7 STEPHEN SIMPSON: With respect to the Indian 8 9 preference question, the answer is no, that the issue of Indian preference - Indian preference does 10 apply to the Bureau of Indian Affairs. 11 12 currently in litigation as to how much that applies throughout the rest of the Department. However, the 13 agencies that are currently - the agencies that are 14 15 being sued on that are the Office of the Assistant Secretary, Indian Affairs, and the Office of the 16 17 Special Trustee for American Indians, not the National Park Service. 18 COLIN KIPPEN: If - is there any process by 19 which that issue could - I'm not sure whether that's 20 an issue that comes within our committee's 21 22 jurisdiction, but the broader question is Native 23 people involved in something that has to do very, 24 very much with what they value and care about. STEPHEN SIMPSON: Indian preference is statutory 25

under the Indian Reorganization Act of 1934. It would probably be -

1

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

COLIN KIPPEN: My question is the scope STEPHEN SIMPSON: - it would need to be - the
question is the scope, yes, and any change in the
hiring practices - any required change in the hiring
practices of the NAGPRA Program or any other part of
the Federal Government would need to be statutory.

SHERRY HUTT: That being said, I have to tell you, Mr. Chair, that when the last opening in the National NAGPRA Program for a staff member and any opening that I've - we've had a hundred percent turnover in the staff, professional staff in the program, and at each time I've wanted to make sure that all of those openings were broadly advertised, and I have made dozens of phone calls to people in Indian Country to get people to apply for those positions. And I can as well document the evidence on this as we go forward if you so like, but we have an opening now. It will be posted shortly. keep it posted for as - an open period - I mean, we need to get the position filled, but we will keep it open because it takes time for the word to get out a lot of times and for people to decide if they want to move to DC and take a position. And I'm looking

1	to get the most robust applicant pool that we
2	possibly can, and I'd be delighted to see numerous
3	applications from people in Indian Country.
4	COLIN KIPPEN: Thank you.
5	Mr. Tarler?
6	DAVID TARLER: Mr. Chairman, might we take a 10-
7	minute break, please.
8	COLIN KIPPEN: All right. Thank you. We'll be
9	in recess for ten minutes.
10	BREAK
11	COLIN KIPPEN: I would like to reconvene the
12	meeting and continue with the public comments.
13	Mr. Tarler?
14	DAVID TARLER: Mr. Chair, the next person I
15	would like to call is Anthony Garcia from the Hearst
16	Museum at the University of California, Berkeley.
17	COLIN KIPPEN: Mr. Garcia, welcome.
18	PUBLIC COMMENT - ANTHONY GARCIA
19	ANTHONY CARCIA: Thank you. Good morning,
20	members of the committee, National NAGPRA Director
21	who is not here, and everyone else and to the
22	audience. Thank you. My name is Anthony Garcia.
23	I'm the Repatriation Coordinator for the Phoebe
24	Hearst Museum of Anthropology in Berkeley,
25	California. I come here to give you a little report
	Lesa Koscielski Consulting

on where we've gone since the last time I talked before this committee I guess seven months ago.

And in a quick rundown, as we have been — as I see as we have been improving our ability to reach out to tribes to get into consultations and to move forward, I can report to the committee that we have one repatriation which just has gone forth three months ago, one pending Notice of Intent to Repatriate which will be a repatriation in — before the end of June, and seven active claims now that we are working with tribes to get their claims through, and we believe that is a good number that we have. We also have seven more claim requests that we're working in consultation with other tribes who wish to put a claim forth and are working with us so that we can assist them in that process.

We have two Notice of Inventory Completions
that we are working on that have been a great deal
of work for the museum to do. They're very large
collections that we are trying to, one, change the
classification of many of the remains from
culturally unidentifiable to culturally affiliated
which we are doing and hope to do in the upcoming
month or two, and a lot of work we're doing, a lot
of consultations, a lot of phone consultations, and

1	a lot of activities along the line of our newly
2	constituted Berkeley campus committee, which is now
3	made up of three members from the anthropological
4	community at Berkeley and three members from campus-
5	wide communities which are faculty members and
6	lawyers, two of which are Native American. And I
7	wanted to bring that to you and ask you if you had
8	any questions for the Hearst Museum that I can take
9	or answer.
10	COLIN KIPPEN: Thank you, Mr. Garcia.
11	Committee?
12	SONYA ATALAY: I do have one quick question. I
13	just wondered in terms of the Review Committee
14	you're talking about, you mentioned that there's
15	faculty who are involved in this and I wonder - and
16	you also mention there are Native people who are on
17	the committee, I wonder if any of the faculty - if
18	there are any Native faculty who are on that
19	committee.
20	ANTHONY GARCIA: Yes, the two Native members
21	that I'm talking about are faculty on the campus.
22	SONYA ATALAY: And are those names publically
23	available who are on your committee?
24	ANTHONY GARCIA: Yes, all the names of all the
25	committee members are publically available.

SONYA ATALAY: Could you share those names with 1 2 our committee today? ANTHONY GARCIA: Okay. If you would like, yes. 3 The names - let's see if I can run down the list. 5 I'll start with the team from the anthropology, Dr. Tim White, Dr. Kent Lightfoot, and Dr. Ira 6 Jacknis, all three are either curators or staff 7 related to the museum. The other three members, 8 9 which joined the end of last year, is Professor Phil Frickey from the Boalt Law School who is the Chair 10 of the committee and an expert in litigation on 11 Native American cases and also has extensive 12 13 experience in NAGPRA law. The last two is Karen Biestman, who teaches in American studies and is a 14 15 Native American, and Joseph Myers, who teaches in Native American studies and is also a lawyer and a 16 17 Native American. So those are the six members, plus of course, the Director Jud King, who goes before 18 the committee as well as I do before the committee. 19 SONYA ATALAY: Thank you. 20 COLIN KIPPEN: Committee members, comments, 21 22 questions? 23 ERIC HEMENWAY: I have a quick question. 24 mentioned consultation. How far does the university 25 take their consultation because from my personal

experience with museums, a lot of times they'll send us a letter and they'll call that consultation when in reality consultation is -

ANTHONY GARCIA: Yes, I'm very familiar with this in the history of study - the history of how consultation is interpreted, both at the Phoebe Hearst and at other institutions. And I can tell you that consultation to me is a real important part of how we work with the tribes today since we have complied with the law before this date. Now we meet with tribes as often as we can in any way in which they would want to meet with us. Some ask us to come to their tribes. That's very difficult for me to honor all of that because I have to cover everywhere, but we do the best we can.

We invite them in. We invite them in especially to become familiar with the collection that they are going to be putting a claim in for.

And we try to engage them face to face if we can, but we will carry on consultation if they so desire by phone or by email. We do that a lot. We continue it. We have not stopped and we are pushing it. We go after tribes that we know are highly interested in going after a claim from my studying their past correspondence and we try to get into a

dialogue with them to find out why they have stopped 1 coming forth. 2 Some of them have their own issues because of 3 internal organizational change. They are a new 5 person that don't know what has gone on before or 6 it's because of things they've heard that they don't understand about the museum. And because of those 7 kinds of comments it's been - some of them, it has 8 9 been hard for them to sit down with us, but after we explain to them our position we find it's very, very 10 quickly changed and we do get into a dialogue. 11 12 We're trying - that's the biggest struggle we have. SONYA ATALAY: I also have a further question, 13 which is just I know that U.C. Berkeley has quite a 14 15 large collection. ANTHONY GARCIA: Yes, ma'am. 16 17 SONYA ATALAY: You probably know the numbers much better than I do. My estimates are around 18 13,000 sets of human remains. 19 ANTHONY GARCIA: That's very close. 20 SONYA ATALAY: Most of those from my 21 22 understanding and looking at some of the data are 23 culturally unidentifiable. Is that correct? 24 ANTHONY GARCIA: That's correct. A large number 25 of them have been put into the category of

culturally unidentifiable and we are working with tribes as a request and as we understand to change those decisions that were made. In some cases I think they were probably made not with good scientific explanation, and we are changing them.

SONYA ATALAY: I think because of the - as we were speaking about yesterday and the large numbers that we're talking about here, I'll look forward to hearing further in future meetings as to how things are proceeding with these consultations.

ANTHONY GARCIA: I promise the next time I come before the meeting I hope to have even new information as to how we go into this direction because I know this is the most sensitive area we have. We have a very large number and it's - we have learned - we are learning that we may have hastily made those determinations and we're trying to correct that.

SONYA ATALAY: That's - I think hopefully what we'll see in future meetings is being able to use U.C. Berkeley as a model of taking these large collections and turning them from culturally unidentifiable into things that eventually - ancestral remains that go home to where they belong. I hope that we'll be able to use your university as

a model for this, something that we can proud of.

So we'll be keeping a close eye on what happens and look forward to your future reports. Thank you for coming forward and talking about this.

DAN MONROE: Just a quick question. I'd applaud all the progress that is being made at U.C. Berkeley at the Phoebe Hearst Museum. It's great to see the kinds of changes that are occurring there. In terms of the process for this transition from classification as CUI to culturally identified, is that being spurred by specifically requests by tribes or is there a systematic effort to go back and look at those designations within the museum itself?

ANTHONY GARCIA: Actually two-fold, yes. Tribes are especially the ones who are coming forth asking that to be changed. They're making special requests. Some don't understand it enough and want to sit down and they explain it out and we determine this is what they're trying to do, and we work with them quite often that way. We are ourselves going after areas, very large areas that we believed were identified as culturally unidentifiable and realized that, oh no, this is quite wrong and it was in haste in the inventories and we're right now working - we

have archaeologists and other scientists working right now on this to change one very large area which we hope to report in some future months that this has been completely turned around. It won't be all - it won't be all changed to culturally affiliated. There still will be some that will be unidentifiable but it won't be anything like it was reported originally.

DAN MONROE: Terrific. Thank you.

I'm wondering if there are plans then for those remains that aren't determined to be identifiable to do dispositions as we've seen so successfully here in this meeting yesterday, that those dispositions could be done. You could come to some disposition agreement with tribes. And also if you're considering and are working with nonfederally recognized groups as well because I know they can be included in the process as long as they're working with federally recognized tribes.

ANTHONY GARCIA: Yes, it just so happens we are working with a very large collection for an area where there is no recognized tribe. We're working with a federally unrecognized tribe right now to try to change or try to find a process. We've been

1	meeting with them for now three months. We've
2	looked at the collection. We've determined that
3	they have a very good case to try to get these
4	remains and objects returned to them. There is, of
5	course, the process of having another tribe that is
6	recognized do it for them. This tribe doesn't want
7	to do it that way. They want the Hearst Museum with
8	them in a partnership to get it repatriated to them,
9	and we're trying to use partly as muscle to get this
10	accomplished is that they are before the
11	acknowledgements right now. They're on a list of
12	waiting tribes to be acknowledged. They're very
13	high on the list. They met all the criteria for
14	acknowledgement as a tribe, the membership and
15	everything else they're supposed to have. All
16	they're waiting for is their chance to go before
17	that organization to become a tribe. Meanwhile, we
18	would like to not wait because that could be many
19	years down the road. The museum is actively right
20	now, the Director and myself, working with this
21	tribe to get these objects in some way returned to
22	them.
23	SONYA ATALAY: Great. Wonderful progress. I
24	look forward to hearing more. Thank you.
25	COLIN KIPPEN: Thank you.

1 ANTHONY GARCIA: Thank you very much.

DAN MONROE: Thank you.

COLIN KIPPEN: Mr. Tarler.

DAVID TARLER: Mr. Chairman, I'd like to call Frank Wozniak, the National NAGPRA Coordinator for the USDA Forest Service.

COLIN KIPPEN: Good morning.

## PUBLIC COMMENT - FRANK WOZNIAK

FRANK WOZNIAK: Good morning. Mr. Chairman, members of the committee, I want to thank you for this opportunity to make a brief presentation to you. I am the National NAGPRA Coordinator for the USDA Forest Service and have been in that capacity since early 2001. However, before that and still continuing, I am the NAGPRA Coordinator for the Southwestern Region of the USDA Forest Service and have held that position since September of 1992. That appointment indicates the seriousness with which the Forest Service treats NAGPRA and has from the very beginning of this process.

Today, I want to mention three particular items. First of all I want to mention the 2008 farm bill. We're not talking about farm subsidies or other things of that sort. What it is, there's a provision in the 2008 farm bill that gives formal

Congressional authorization to the Forest Service to rebury Native American human remains and funerary objects on Forest Service land where those remains have come from sites on Forest Service land or from sites that are adjacent to Forest Service lands.

And there is a legal definition of adjacency and everything which we don't need to go into unless you have a question about that.

Now, this is — these reburials are permitted where the culturally affiliated tribe or tribes request that this occur, and should point out that this is a formal Congressional authorization.

However, under its discretionary authorities in land management, the Forest Service has permitted and has carried out reburials of Native American human remains from Forest Service lands since the summer of 1991, so very early in the process we had in place at least an informal policy that permitted that. So there is the farm bill, and if you have questions I'm more than happy to answer about that.

Secondly, I wanted to give you just a brief update on NAGPRA implementation by the Forest Service for Fiscal Year 2009. By the end of September 2009, the end of the formal fiscal year, the Forest Service will have repatriated and

provided for the reburials of 305 - 301 sets of
Native American human remains, 1,826 associated
funerary objects, and 80 unassociated funerary
objects. These repatriations and reburials will
have occurred under three separate repatriations.
The repatriations will be in one instance to the
Pueblo of Jemez who are the sole cultural
affiliates, in another instance to the Pueblo of
Acoma, the Hopi Tribe, and the Pueblo of Zuni, who
are the cultural affiliates, and in the final
instance to the Tohono O'odham Nation as the lead
for the O'odham peoples in Southern and Central
Arizona.

Finally, I wanted to point out a problem with the culturally unidentifiable database. In late March, I discovered that the numbers of Native American human remains and associated funerary objects that are listed in that database had suddenly and precipitously nearly doubled from what we had reported to the Park Service and which we had reviewed two years prior to that. I had also kept an awareness of that database through frequent consultations with it in the time between our formal review of the database for the Forest Service and March of 2009.

For us, this is a very serious problem. 1 suddenly we could have twice the number of 2 culturally unidentifiable human remains than we had 3 reported. We have brought this to the attention of the National NAGPRA Program and they have indicated 5 6 that they will be reviewing this. However, I think that the review will not be a simple one because 7 I've gone through the entries for National Forests 8 9 in that database and it's not a simple replication of records. It's more complicated than that, and 10 therefore I believe that the National NAGPRA Program 11 will have to do an item-by - line-by-line review of 12 the entire database to find out where those 13 duplications have occurred and hopefully identify 14 15 why, but at least to have identified where they have occurred. I think that because of that - this 16 17 episode, that the problem might lie not only in the records that they are maintained therefore that 18 19 database for the Forest Service, but for those records for other entities, other Federal agencies, 20 museums, etcetera. And other parties might be 21 advised - find it advisable to review that database 22 23 to identify if that has occurred in their records. With that I'm finished and would be more than 24 25 happy to entertain any questions or comments that

1 you might have.

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

COLIN KIPPEN: Thank you, Mr. Wozniak.

Do we have any comments or questions?

DAN MONROE: Just a quick question, are you asserting that the results or that the reason for the doubling in CUI is a result of duplications that have been somehow inserted or is there some other cause?

FRANK WOZNIAK: It appears that it's a somewhat complex pattern of duplications. Initially, I thought it was just a simple duplication of records where you simply - you had listed - for one forest you had three listings of culturally unidentifiable remains with three, one and two - you know, three sets in one, one in another, and two in another. And then they simply doubled it and you had the same entry in the same order. However, it's more complex than that because I had to go systematically through it, checking off one against the other and everything of that sort, and so it isn't just you took the record and it happened to be doubled in the same order in which it was in the list - in the database, but it appears to be - there's a certain randomness in which the pattern occurs. appears to be pretty much a doubling, though not

1	completely. There are some instances where I can't
2	figure out what really happened, and it would really
3	take some person who's a professional at IT to
4	figure it all out. But I thought I should bring it
5	to your attention because it could be a problem
6	particularly given the numbers that we're talking
7	about in terms of culturally unidentifiable. You
8	know, if we're talking about a hundred thousand or
9	more, maybe it's a hundred thousand or maybe it's
10	only fifty thousand or maybe it's more than a
11	hundred thousand. At this state of the record
12	regarding Forest Service we have an approximate
13	doubling of the numbers.
14	DAN MONROE: So David, the National NAGPRA
15	Office is looking into this, is that correct?
16	DAVID TARLER: Well, Mr. Monroe, I'm not
17	familiar with the issue. I'm sure it was brought to
18	the attention of both Sherry Hutt and to Jaime
19	Lavallee, our notice coordinator.
20	FRANK WOZNIAK: Yes, that's correct.
21	DAVID TARLER: I know it's been said many times
22	before but I'll repeat again, we act in a
23	ministerial capacity, and in compiling this database
24	we take the information that is provided to us.
25	DAN MONROE: Yeah, I understand. So the

responsibility to sort this out lies with what agency, Forest Service?

FRANK WOZNIAK: Well, we have reported it to - I reported it to Jaime first of all, Jaime Lavallee first of all, and then secondly to Sherry Hutt. And they said it would be looked into and that they were broadly aware that this problem had been occurring and that it would be addressed at some point in time. I'm not sure when that will occur, but given the seriousness of the matter of culturally unidentifiable and the need of this committee to address that issue in a formal and deliberative fashion, I felt I had an obligation to mention that in this case.

DAN MONROE: But it sounds quickly as if this is the situation, the NAGPRA office is simply compiling these inventories, and it's not going to be the National NAGPRA Office that actually sorts out what's happened with the Forest Service inventory, correct?

DAVID TARLER: Not with respect to the inventories, but certainly with respect to the numbers that we report. That we will sort out.

DAN MONROE: Yeah, but this sounds like it's shaping out as a classical falls-between-the-crack

1 situation.

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

FRANK WOZNIAK: No, it's not going to because we're not going to let it fall between the cracks, on behalf - on the part of the agency that I work for.

DAN MONROE: Good.

FRANK WOZNIAK: We intend to keep on top of it, and you know, we - doubling the numbers presents an image that we don't care to have.

DAN MONROE: Good.

COLIN KIPPEN: Mr. Wozniak, I want to thank you for your testimony here today. I too am really concerned about the database, and it's for a broader Obviously we are concerned with the policy reason. number of culturally unidentified individuals, humans, that are in that database, but the other the other bigger sort of administrative issue and policy issue for us is that we're supposed to be looking into policy issues that are based upon data and information and our ability to focus and make any kind of recommendations about anything is really dependant upon a set of data, a fund of data, that we can have some confidence in as we then begin to try to sort out, and I think as Mr. Monroe said, the issues and things and problems that may be falling

in the cracks. And we - I really sympathize with the situation that National NAGPRA is in because they are the receptacle for what each of the individual line agencies do and report. And yet, you know, we - the place where all of that is expressed is through the National Park Service, National NAGPRA Office, and so they can only be as accurate or credible as each of the line agencies that report to them, and so I think this is a constant theme.

I have great hope for the kinds of work that the Government Accountability Office may have to help us better understand sort of how this system or lack of one in total works, so that we can understand better how to suggest policy changes and policy improvements, and also really to allow the community — and when I say community I mean the tribal members, museums, Federal agencies, everyone who cares about these issues — to be able to make decisions and to be able to have some confidence that our recommendations and our findings are based on credible information. Because without that, it's just arbitrary and it's capricious, and we may as well just disband this organization if we can't get the data to be able to really look into, you know,

what things maybe need to be changed or what things need to be amplified to make it work well. So I really appreciate your comments. It is a bit of a courageous step to come forward and to say we notice a doubling and we're not really sure why, and we're looking into that and we care about that. I think that's a very positive statement.

FRANK WOZNIAK: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

DAN MONROE: Thank you very much.

FRANK WOZNIAK: Could I say just one further thing along those lines? It appears that this whole issue arose from the update of the database that was done in March, and you know, there seems to have been some aberration that occurred or aberrations that occurred during that update. And we became aware of it because the numbers for my agency were correct as of the end of January 2009. In the end of March of 2009, we had this doubling, shall we say, and therefore it occurred in there and it was suggested to me by the National NAGPRA Program that it most probably was during that update process that there occurred this pattern and everything of that sort.

DAN MONROE: Who updated?

FRANK WOZNIAK: What?

DAN MONROE: Who did the update?

FRANK WOZNIAK: The National NAGPRA Program updated its CUI database in March, and you'll notice on the webpage it says, you know, updated as of March 2009. I noticed that and that's why I thought that that's why that might have occurred. Anyway, so they're investigating it but we're very concerned that our numbers be correct in that database. I mean, we know what the numbers are. We have them, but if it's not correct in the national database then issues can occur that we prefer not occur.

COLIN KIPPEN: Mr. Tarler, do you have any information that there are other Federal line agencies that may be experiencing similar trends with their data?

DAVID TARLER: Mr. Chairman, I have no knowledge whatsoever. This is not an area for which I have any responsibility.

COLIN KIPPEN: I would like to ask that at the next NAGPRA meeting that there be a discussion just about this point, because we normally receive an update on the database and I would just like in that update that we address any agency issues that — other agency — line agencies issues that may have arisen, and I would particularly like to just hear a

little bit or have discussed with the committee what's going on with respect to the Forest Service. Again, I think it's something that we need to keep our finger on. It may be just part of a trend. There may be other agencies that may be affected as well, and again, we — I'm not blaming anyone here.

This is very complicated. Again, all the line agencies report. All of that information comes into a big pot and it's the National Park Service that is supposed to make sense of it and put it onto a website. So that - this process I think is - has numerous points at which unintended error can enter into the process. So I - and the better we are at being able to describe that process in a clear way the better able we will be to address it and also to have some confidence that our numbers are credible and that our picture is accurate of the status quo. So thank you very much again.

FRANK WOZKIAK: Exactly. Mr. Chairman, I can assure you that I will be there at the meeting in Sarasota, and I will have available with me the breakdown forest by forest on that and can point out - if those errors persist, can point out where those errors lie, at least on paper. I don't - have no idea where they lie within the database, but at

least on paper I can do that for you and be more than happy to do so.

COLIN KIPPEN: Thank you.

DAN MONROE: Thank you.

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

FRANK WOZNIAK: Thank you very much.

COLIN KIPPEN: Mr. Tarler.

DAVID TARLER: Mr. Chairman, I'd like to call
Art Hutchinson, Superintendent of Great Sand Dunes
National Park.

# PUBLIC COMMENT - ART HUTCHINSON/FRED BUNCH

ART HUTCHINSON: Mr. Chairman, I'm Art Hutchinson, the Superintendent of Great Sand Dunes Thank you for this time. With me is National Park. Fred Bunch, my Chief of Resource Management at the same national park. The reason I would like to discuss this with you today is to show you that NAGPRA has so many positive and extremely rewarding outcomes. During the - maybe a little bit of history first. Great Sand Dunes National Park is American's newest full national park, and that happened in the process in 2000 to 2004. that expansion from being a national monument, we inherited a lot of former ranchlands that many of the sands that are part of this great formation of sand dunes is out there, and in that were many of

these interdunal ponds, etcetera, which were rich places for peoples for thousands of years. We have sites that go back at least 10,000 years out there. So there are plenty of opportunities for inadvertent discoveries today, tomorrow, and in the past.

1

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

During the process of this - the NAGPRA work that we were doing, I looked around this landscape which is surrounded by 14,000 foot peaks and the Rio Grande River runs through the middle of it, and said other Federal agencies have lands just like ours. And we - from past experience I know that tribal groups have a - it's hard to get to meetings, it's expensive to do these consultations, why not do it together. And so I called my line officer counterparts from the Forest Service, the BLM, Fish and Wildlife Service and Bureau of Reclamation and said, we are going to consult. We've been consulting before in a smaller way but we are going to take this on full bore here and would you like to participate. And after some discussions they said And this included tribes that had not even probably thought about the San Luis Valley before and we sent out over 70-some letters. We called many people and we have 12 active tribes now who have signed or are in the process of signing an MOU

with these 4 or 5 Federal agencies dealing with future inadvertent discoveries.

And the best part of it is it is an ongoing dialogue. We now have updated databases. We have phone numbers, fax. People have come to the valley for consultations. We have gone into New Mexico. Ohkay Owingeh Pueblo sponsored the third of our consultations. And I believe at this point we have one of the better examples of how NAGPRA has led to a very proactive stance by all groups to get together and discuss everything from inadvertent discoveries to resources that may be scarce on tribal lands that one of us in agencies can participate in.

So I would just like to point out that NAGPRA has so many positive spinoffs. Yes, it's a lot of work, but I think overall the tribes are saving time, money. We are saving time and money as Federal agencies by working together on a very positive experience. So the San Luis Valley, we are under the Service First authority, but we don't need that. We just need that ability to work together and the willingness to work together. And with that I'm going to turn over this last bit to Fred to kind of add a couple of points.

COLIN KIPPEN: Good morning.

FRED BUNCH: Good morning, Mr. Chairman. This document is intended to be a living document and that all the signatories on both the Federal side and the tribal side have a chance for review and to add tribal members or tribes as desired. We are constantly reaching out to the whole area and all the affiliated peoples in that region.

ART HUTCHINSON: And in the future, if there are other areas of the country that want to look at this particular MOU that we have in place, we would of course probably consult first to make sure that that's okay. We believe it's a very transparent document that will work for many parts of the country and hope that it's looked at as a model. Thank you.

COLIN KIPPEN: Mr. Hutchinson, thank you. So I take it what you're telling us is that you've established an MOU process that's very broad-ranging and comprehensive. How many - how many groups are involved in that process?

ART HUTCHINSON: Right now there are 12 tribes that are - could be part of this. We are of course not requiring tribal signatures. All of the representatives, the NAGPRA representatives at these

consultations have agreed to this. The language has been agreed to, and now of course it's just finally getting tribal signatures, proper ones on those. have waited purposely until after this process that we have been here and I testified yesterday so that we can now move forward and not confuse NAGPRA with the future. But again, we hope that gave us this proactive stance for all the Federal agencies and I just want to emphasize that each one of the other line officers is very enthusiastic about it. didn't have to you, you know, prod them into it. They said this is the right thing to do. And again, it works for this specific area because all the tribes somehow or another have affiliation somewhere in the distant or recent past to this valley.

1

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

COLIN KIPPEN: Are there any tribes that are not involved in your process?

ART HUTCHINSON: Not in that particular area.

Probably - yesterday Arden Kucate was there and he's from Pueblo of Zuni, which is quite a ways away.

The Hopi Tribe has sent back a couple of letters.

The Comanche Tribe has supported us in a couple of areas, which are of course on the other side. There are a few of the pueblo groups that have not, for whatever reason, chosen to be involved, and it could

be specifically the Tewas who are more involved in our valley than the other puebloan groups in New Mexico. One thing that I also noticed that was very positive was when Ohkay Owingeh Pueblo said we will host the third of these, as the tribal representation at that meeting went way up. So by us traveling south of the New Mexico line there certainly increased the participation.

Federal line officers have also - we've agreed that we will now, the three or four of us will jump in a car on an annual basis and go visit them as well to continue this process. We now have tribes that come up and ask for, for example, in the Great Sand Dunes there are magnetite that's on the sand that are used in Apache ceremonial painting. Last year we were asked if we could find some deer meat for one of the tribes that they did not have access to, and I found a source for that through an outfitter, and Fred and I drove it down for the ceremony. So consultation goes many ways and it takes, I guess, a lot of commitment but it's the right thing to do.

COLIN KIPPEN: Thank you. Further questions?

Comments?

DAN MONROE: I'd just like to applaud you for

1	taking proactive steps and creating a really
2	terrific program. Great work. And we should do
3	everything we can to actually publicize this kind of
4	initiative, and I very, very much appreciate it.
5	ART HUTCHINSON: It was suggested that we bring
6	this up today. It wasn't our - it's the right
7	outcome and so thank you for giving us the time to
8	share that.
9	DAN MONROE: It's fantastic, and it's a great
10	park also.
11	ART HUTCHINSON: It is.
12	COLIN KIPPEN: Thank you.
13	ERIC HEMENWAY: Thank you.
14	COLIN KIPPEN: Mr. Tarler?
15	DAVID TARLER: Mr. Chairman, if Joe Brennan or
16	Helen Robbins are present and wish to make comment
17	then I invite them to do so. And if not, then that
18	concludes my list of people who've asked to make
19	public comment, and should you desire we can open
20	the floor to other public comment.
21	COLIN KIPPEN: I don't see - I would like to -
22	you've called for Joe Brennan or Helen Robbins.
23	DAVID TARLER: Yes, Mr. Chairman.
24	COLIN KIPPEN: And they don't appear to be
25	present. I would like to open it up at this time
	Lesa Koscielski Consulting

for anyone who has comments to come forward and as you come forward please just identify yourself for the record. We're in the public comment phase and we would like to hear from you.

Thank you and good morning.

### PUBLIC COMMENT - ROBIN WILSON

ROBIN WILSON: Good morning. My name is Norma

Jean Robin Wilson. I just wanted to give you a

little bit of feedback on this weekend here in

Seattle. I attended the grants writing class, and

it was - I just want to say thank you to NAGPRA for

their outreach that they have done with NPI. And it

was also like - it was also an awareness on my part

as well to understand the people of Hawaii. There

were a number of people in the room, in the class,

in the grant writing class who were from Hawaii and

I did not really grasp the issues that were taking

place. So that was quite the networking

opportunity. So that was great, and so awareness

and learning is taking place.

I understand your next three meetings are in the East Coast. I would ask that you consider that one or two of them or partial of them be webcast available for people who are on the West Coast. I think it might be - it could be a test of some kind,

something to consider, you know, the number of people who might join the webcast as a possibility because the three will be on the East Coast.

And I understand with your next — especially your next meeting in meeting with the panel that you're going to attempt to develop and try to communicate why there are so many culturally unidentifiable remains, I think it might be — I think that might be worthwhile for everyone to understand rather than to have hunches why it's such a large number. Some things to think about in asking some questions of that panel may include access. Access seems to be an issue left and right. Now it's access to information, access to meeting notes, access seems to be an issue that I hear in Indian Country.

Another question to consider asking if you so desire is transparency, is the museum transparent.

And I think one thing I learned over this weekend is a survey. Has the - has the museum done a survey with the tribal communities to see if they have transparency.

I heard over - from you, Mr. Kippen, with the dispositions about the template that you are using now within the NAGPRA Review part. I'm wondering if

that is all considerable for it to go as a template on the website so that people might be able to use that for consultation purposes so that people can have some movement in the consultation process rather than an ah-ha moment because I'm sure that ah-ha moment is pretty rough publically, personally speaking.

Again, I'd like to thank Jan, Sangita, and
NAGPRA staff for the weekend. It was very
educational. I wish everyone on the Review
Committee. I enjoy the comments about the person
who is not here. It is a highly important weekend
in tribal community this weekend in recognizing
people who are not with us, and I thank you for your
time. I look forward to hearing more developments
with this process. Thanks.

COLIN KIPPEN: Thank you. Do we have any comments, questions?

DAN MONROE: Thank you.

COLIN KIPPEN: I would like to say that I think a couple of the things that were recommended by Norma Jean Robin Wilson, our last witness, I think are things that we should think about. The idea of a webcast is something that we really haven't thought about and considered, and I would like - I

would ask that Mr. DFO you just have a conversation and provide us with some feedback about that possibility.

The conversation about access to information is really very, very appropriate. Every time we come out and do these hearings, what we're always told and in fact you should know that some of the members themselves feel like the process that we go through is rather stilted and is at times not easy for people, especially lay people to understand. And we're trying to figure out a way to do that better. But we are an administrative agency and we have some fence lines that we have to stay inside of, but we understand the concern about access whether it be to information or to notes.

We also understand this question about transparency because a lot of times the decisions are really hard to make, and if you don't have a transparent process, then anything that comes out of that decision-making process is going to be viewed as not credible. So you've got to do everything you can to make the process credible because the decisions are really difficult to make.

And the final suggestion was about putting a template on a website. The template that is being

used by the people who come forward for dispositions and (portion of comment inaudible) most of my professional life dealing with conflict and chaos that one of the ways to get out of any ditch is a process, is a fair process, and a template is a great way to get out of any ditch, a template that structures the things that people are going to talk about. But the template needs to be fair and it needs to be representative, and it can't simply just be, you know, favoring one world view. It needs to be something that is very holistic that people can look at and say that works for me.

But I do know that templates are very, very helpful because when you can't talk anymore and you step back and have a conversation about how is it we're going to make this decision, not what the decision is going to be but how are we going to make it, and what are the things that we'll know when we've made the right decision? What are the attributes of what a good decision will look like? Once you start people thinking not about their specific sort of positions but actually something broader, you really move to that place where you're able to move forward, and I've seen that happen time and time again. When we can't talk anymore step

1	back and say, you know, if we were to make a right
2	decision, what would that look like? What would be
3	the attributes of it? And this template I think has
4	helped us to create that system. So I like the
5	suggestion about the template. Mr. Tarler, is that
6	- my understanding was the template was on the
7	website. Is it not on the website?
8	DAVID TARLER: The template for requesting
9	recommendations regarding agreements -
10	COLIN KIPPEN: Yes.
11	DAVID TARLER: - is on the website.
12	COLIN KIPPEN: It is on the website.
13	DAVID TARLER: Yes, it is.
14	COLIN KIPPEN: Okay. So I would - I would ask
15	Ms. Norma Jean Robin Wilson to please just come back
16	if you're still here and we can have a conversation
17	about how to get access to that.
18	I would also say that any other suggestions
19	anyone may have about processes and ways to improve
20	any of the work of NAGPRA, we welcome those
21	suggestions, because again when you're making really
22	difficult decisions, stepping back and asking what
23	does a righteous and a good decision look like is
24	really the key way to get people to not focus on the

Lesa Koscielski Consulting Rapid City, South Dakota (605) 342-3298

immediate - what their individual perspectives are

25

but now to focus on what it will look like and be when they are on the other side of having created a good decision.

So Mr. Tarler, next witness? No more further witnesses? Anyone want to come forward and speak?

It seems like we're at that moment where we're about to be done here.

DAVID TARLER: Mr. Chairman?

COLIN KIPPEN: Yes.

DAVID TARLER: I would just like to comment that prior to this meeting we did look into the possibility of making it available telephonically, and we believe that the cost was prohibitive and so we weren't able to do that. But it is certainly something that we would like to do and we will continue to look into the various technological means of making Review Committee meetings available to a wider public.

DAN MONROE: I just suggest that we might explore WebEx as a possibility for doing video conferencing. That's very, very inexpensive, very effective and easy to use. And you can get in touch with me and I'll give you some information because my institution is using it much more frequently, and it would be a way at a minimum to assure that people

could very readily and easily from any computer sign up and give testimony that everybody here could see. It may also solve some of the other issues. I think it would be very, very helpful to do that and we should explore it. The telephonic connections are actually extraordinarily difficult to follow and quite not actually that effective, I don't think, but we should continue to explore it. I think it's a great idea.

## COMMENT - COLIN KIPPEN

COLIN KIPPEN: Before we conclude and just for those of you in the audience and for the staff, what we normally will do is we'll just have some comments at the end. I just want to queue up something, not as part of my final comments, but just to say that - and I need to say this so that it is on the record, as you know there has been a change in the rules that govern this body, and one of those changes is that there is no quorum requirement. What that means is that one person could be making decisions that are substantial. And we have suggested that that rule be changed and that's a very important point.

I want to now just for the record indicate that it is my - it is to my knowledge that there has been

some great difficulty at times with things like arranging travel for our National NAGPRA committee members, that there - I have talked with some of the members and I know that some of them experienced difficulty in getting - in being able to arrange the travel to get to these meetings.

There has also been some difficulties with us receiving reimbursement for our expenses. We would prefer that they would hold these meetings at a Motel 6 so that the amount of money we have to lay out would be substantially less, but that's not the way we proceed. So I personally have, you know, expenses going back over a year and a half.

The reason I say this and the reason I want this to be on the record is because these are all things that affect the ability of people to come to meetings, and when you have a requirement now that there be no quorum, it is something that needs to be addressed very - it needs to be addressed and taken care of, so there is no possibility that people are not attending because of administrative breakdowns. And if there is an administrative breakdown, the power of the committee and its ability to render fair decisions in a way that people perceive as fair will be undercut. And my intention as long as I'm

here, and I know it is the same of everyone that sits on this committee, is that we have to protect the process because by protecting the process we protect the result, and if the process is viewed as not fair, the result will be viewed as not fair.

And that is absolutely something we cannot allow to happen.

So I am making this point on the record because it may have an impact if we are not able to get our members here, if we are not able to reimburse them for their expenses, if we are not able to assure that we will have a functioning committee because of the fact that there is no quorum requirement presently. So that's the only point I would like to make for the record.

I want to also have the record reflect that I have been - this issue has been explained. I understand that part of the issue may be a change in administrations, a change in process, all of the resources that now exist going into stimulus activity. Agencies are literally busy in ways they've never been busy before. So I understand all of that. I just wanted to make it a point that we understand and we expect that there will be the highest level of compliance by our - that we will

use the highest and best efforts to get our folks here and to make sure that these administrative matters are attended to because it may affect our ability to get people to meetings and I think that's important for us to do.

So I'd like to now call on Dan Monroe as we leave and I'd like to just - I'd like him to give us some of his closing comments or thoughts.

#### CLOSING COMMENTS

DAN MONROE: Well, first I'd like to thank the NAGPRA Program staff and all of the folks that have been involved with putting the program training and all of the other activities together for their good work. I would reiterate perhaps in a more direct way that it's actually essential for members of the Review Committee, especially those who don't have institutional backing, to be paid in a timely manner for the expenses out of pocket and I would hope that that problem gets solved and also the travel issue solved, and these are important administrative matters that have been longstanding issues.

I also thank everyone who's participated for your patience and for your willingness to come forward and take part in this process to share your ideas and your suggestions, your observations and

your criticisms, all of that's really essential for this to work effectively. And finally, as always, I'd like to honor and respect the spirit of collaboration that works, not withstanding the fact that obviously there are friction points, but the intent of NAGPRA in spirit is to address basic civil rights, religious rights, and to create a balance between those and other activities that pertain to the creation of a culture and a society at large, not only just within Native American tribes, that is one that's based on honor and respect. And I thank all of you for participating in that as well. would just end to say that we look forward to continuing to do this work, to doing it with your investment as well, and to make sure that this law, which is really so vitally important, is implemented in ways that fulfill its ambitions both in spirit and in letter. Thank you all.

COLIN KIPPEN: Eric.

1

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

ERIC HEMENWAY: I'd like to say thank you for everybody attending this meeting and for the National NAGPRA Program and my fellow Review Committee members that are left here. It's been quite an experience for my first meeting. It was getting - just getting a hang of presenting and

whole new relationship with the program and with the committee members and it's a big change. And I can see a lot of change going on right now with the - you know, the law and NAGPRA and we've got new committee members coming in. We have a new committee chair. We have new laws. We have new procedures, but I feel confident that we'll work through all this change and to start doing real productive work in the very near future.

And I always like to remind myself when things get really complicated that the big picture is Native American Graves Protection and Repatriation, and what we want to do is repatriate and get what needs to go back to the appropriate parties. And also to protect these areas that these ancestors are interred in. And I'd just like to say in my Native language, (Native American language). That means I will see you again later. We don't have a word for goodbye. And I'll leave it at that.

COLIN KIPPEN: I want to thank both of the members, Dan and Eric, for their comments. I want to thank actually all of the members that we've served on this committee with, some who have had to leave because of travel requirements but also some

who are no longer on this committee who really assisted us. This has not been easy work. And it would be considerably difficult without the work of David Tarler and Carla Mattix and Stephen Simpson, our attorney, and Sherry Hutt, the Director of the program, as well as Lesa Koscielski, I hope I didn't slay your last name, but the National NAGPRA staff who have come before us and who work with us and allow us to be successful in what we do.

This may be my last meeting and, you know, that's well and good and that's fine. I've absolutely enjoyed coming here. I have learned and grown as a person to be part of this process, and I have learned different ways of understanding what it means to respect and be sensitive to other peoples' values and views and life paths. And it has not been easy.

I look back and I think the White Mountain

Apache case that we decided, at least for me, was a moment in the history of this committee which I think I will probably never duplicate in terms of the richness of that moment. We had seven people coming to a united decision from seven very different perspectives, and they did it, you know, verbally on the record. It was for most of us a

free-form moment, and I don't think that I have ever seen anything quite so eloquent or been involved with anything quite so powerful in my life.

So to all of you here, I hope that you will continue your involvement with National NAGPRA. I hope you will tell us, let us know what's going on in the field, and be involved in these proceedings. We know that this is a difficult process to administer. We know that for many of you, especially for many of the tribal members, these issues are very difficult to discuss, they're very difficult to be a part of, and our process at times I know seems very stilted and inappropriate. But it is what it is, and we do the best that we can because we do have fence lines within which we must operate. And those fence lines we didn't create. They're created by the national - by this Federal legislation.

So I'd like to say aloha to all of you. I have absolutely enjoyed being on the committee, and if I am returning then that is fine. If I am not, then whoever it is that takes my place, I hope you will carry forward the work we're trying to accomplish, and I know that you will. I'd like to now just turn this over to Eric and ask him to please send us on

our way with a blessing. Thank you.

### CLOSING - ERIC HEMENWAY

wish everybody a safe journey and once again I say miigwetch, that's thank you in my Native language, (portion of comment inaudible). To the tribes who are still occupying this area, I always remind myself it's a small miracle that we as a Native people are still occupying our aboriginal homes and I like to always acknowledge wherever I go the First Nations are the original home owners, so to speak, of their lands, and I like to say miigwetch for all those people who are putting us up here. Miigwetch.

COLIN KIPPEN: Thank you.

### MEETING ADJOURNED